



DATE: April 12, 2002

TO: Brian Davis

FROM: C. Richard Keller

SUBJECT: Review Of PHR&A Trip Generation Analysis For Suffield Meadows Retirement Community

After reviewing the April 9, 2002 PHR&A memo, we have the following comments.

1. The survey of peak hour traffic at four actual retirement communities was worth the effort because it clearly indicates that the ITE peak hour rates are too low as compared to all four of the sites surveyed by PHR&A.
2. The survey of daily traffic at the four actual retirement communities indicated that at three of the four sites surveyed, the ITE rates are too low. The very large Charlestown Village retirement community reflects less daily traffic (3,820) than ITE rates would estimate (5,109). This may have occurred due to either the data extrapolations by PHR&A or the daily traffic characteristics are different for a very large facility.
3. Applying actual "average" rates derived from four surveyed sites, as shown in PHR&A's Table 5, to estimate the Suffield Meadows generated trips, is one way to estimate the anticipated traffic. However, this technique includes the very "low" rates surveyed at the Charlestown Village site. This process therefore reflects the "lowest" estimate of Suffield Meadows generated traffic as shown in PHR&A's Table 6.
4. We believe it is more accurate to eliminate both the Charlestown Village and Sunnyside surveyed rates from the average rate process because both facilities are so much larger than the Suffield Meadows facility. Using only two of the four surveyed sites (the two Virginia sites), we derived the following rates.

		AM Rate	PM Rate	Daily Rate
Kings Court	220	0.39	0.49	5.39
Westminister	255	0.39	0.44	5.64
Average Rate	238	0.39	0.465	5.515

Applying these average rates to the total units at Suffield Meadows resulted in the following projected trips.

		AM Trips	PM Trips	Daily Trips
Suffield Meadows	152	60	71	839

These volumes are slightly higher than the Table 6 PHR&A volumes shown below using lower rates for all four sites.

Suffield Meadows	152	42	56	645
Difference Using Average of Two Facilities		+18	+15	+194

We believe that the 60 AM, 71 PM and 839 daily trips are a more reasonable estimate of traffic to be generated by Suffield Meadows.

5. Regardless of whether the lower Table 6 PHR&A projections or the higher KELLERCO projections are used for assessing the anticipated traffic impact caused by Suffield Meadows, obviously these estimated volumes alone will not warrant a new traffic signal on Route 29. However, these volumes plus existing Route 673 relocated volumes and new traffic from the Jamison tract across Route 29 may together warrant signalization due to the high (and increasing) peak period volumes on Route 29. This means that were a new signal to be warranted, Suffield Meadows should share in the cost based on a prorata share using the higher KELLERCO estimated trips.
6. The need for a future traffic signal on Route 29 could also be raised based on the need to serve emergency vehicles throughout the day or night should persons staying at Suffield Meadows need emergency care. I had asked Mr. Callow to provide hourly emergency vehicle movement data for each survey site. Apparently it is not yet available. Such data is important because should emergency vehicles ever have a problem entering or leaving Suffield Meadows via the Route 29 intersection, the need for a signal will certainly be raised. Discussions regarding the need for a traffic signal should therefore not be raised simply because of the rather low peak hour generated traffic created by Suffield Meadows.

Please call if you have any questions.

cc: Rick Carr